

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,081	03/19/2004	Sakari Kotola	4208-4047US1	7038
	7590 11/23/200 INNEGAN, L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
3 WORLD FIN	ANCIAL CENTER		YUN, EUGENE	
NEW YORK, I	N1 10201-2101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/23/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOPatentCommunications@Morganfinnegan.com Shopkins@Morganfinnegan.com jmedina@Morganfinnegan.com

		A N				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/804,081	KOTOLA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Eugene Yun	2618			
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAINS on sof time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we use to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133)			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Se	eptember 2007.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	= 11					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-8,16-19 and 52-74 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 52-55 is/are withdraw Claim(s) 1-8 and 16-19 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 56-74 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the case Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	(a) accepted or (b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	,			
12) a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1 Certified copies of the priority documents 2 Certified copies of the priority documents 3 Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachmen	• •					
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

Application/Control Number:

10/804,081 Art Unit: 2618

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 56-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philipsson (US 2001/0007815) in view of Labun et al. (US 6,842,621).

Referring to Claim 56, Philipsson teaches a method, comprising:

detecting a RF-ID interrogation signal in a wireless communication terminal (see lines 3-4 of paragraph [0007]);

responding to the RF-ID interrogation signal by transmitting a RF-ID response signal including identification information relating to a wireless short-range module of the terminal (see paragraphs [0020] and the last 3 lines of [0022]).

Philipsson does not teach providing a notification signal to activate a processor in the wireless communication terminal, and in response to the notification signal, activating the processor to instruct a wireless short-range communication module in the wireless communication terminal to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals. Labun teaches providing a notification signal to activate a processor in the wireless communication terminal, and in response to the notification signal, activating the processor to instruct a wireless short-range communication module in the wireless communication terminal to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting

Art Unit: 2618

paging signals (see col. 9, lines 30-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Labun to said device of Philipsson in order for a user to be better informed of the status of a wireless communication terminal.

Referring to Claim 68, Philipsson teaches a computer program product, executable in a computer system, comprising:

A computer readable medium storing:

Program code for detecting a RF-ID interrogation signal (see lines 3-4 of paragraph [0007]).

Philipsson does not teach generating in a wireless communication terminal a notification of the RF-ID interrogation signal, and program code for providing the notification to activate the processor instructing a wireless short range communication module in the wireless communication terminal to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals. Labun teaches generating in a wireless communication terminal a notification of the RF-ID interrogation signal, and program code for providing the notification to activate the processor instructing a wireless short range communication module in the wireless communication terminal to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals (see col. 9, lines 30-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Labun to said device of Philipsson in order for a user to be better informed of the status of a wireless communication terminal.

Referring to Claim 62, Philipsson teaches an apparatus comprising:

10/804,081 Art Unit: 2618

a processor 21 (fig. 2);

a wireless short-range communication module configured to communicate over a wireless short-range communication connection (see lines 5-6 of paragraph [0019]); and

a near field communication module configured to detect a RF-ID interrogation signal (see lines 3-4 of paragraph [0007]) and send a response signal including identification information relating to the wireless short-range communicant module in response to the RF-ID interrogation signal (see paragraphs [0020] and the last 3 lines of [0022]).

Philipsson does not teach providing to the processor a notification of the interrogation signal of the presence of the RF-ID interrogation signal, and wherein the processor is configured to instruct the wireless short range-communication module to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals to establish a wireless short-range communication connection in response to receiving the notification from the near field communication module. Labun teaches providing to the processor a notification of the interrogation signal of the presence of the RF-ID interrogation signal, and wherein the processor is configured to instruct the wireless short range-communication module to enter into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals to establish a wireless short-range communication connection in response to receiving the notification from the near field communication module (see col. 9, lines 30-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Labun to said device of Philipsson in

Application/Control Number:

10/804,081 Art Unit: 2618

order for a user to be better informed of the status of a wireless communication terminal.

Referring to Claims 57 and 63, Philipsson also teaches including in the RF-ID response signal at least a unique Bluetooth identification number of the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraph [0016]).

Referring to Claims 58 and 64, Philipsson also teaches including in the RF-ID response signal a Bluetooth serial number and Bluetooth Clock Offset information of the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraph [0016]).

Referring to Claims 59, 65, and 69, Labun also teaches entering info a Bluetooth page scan mode after detecting the interrogation signal (see col. 9, lines 30-34).

Referring to Claims 60, 66, and 70, Philipsson also teaches receiving a paging signal as an initial signal to activate the wireless short-range communication module (see paragraph [0022]).

Referring to Claims 61, 67, and 71, Philipsson also teaches skipping an inquiry stage (paragraph [0020]) and initiating a shortened set up upon receiving a paging signal (see paragraph [0025]).

Referring to Claim 72, Labun also teaches instructing the second terminal to enter into a page scanning mode in the notification indicates a Bluetooth connection is acceptable (see 516 of fig. 5).

Referring to Claim 73, Labun also teaches instructing the second terminal to enter into a non-connectable mode in the notification indicates a Bluetooth connection is not acceptable (see col. 9, lines 25-30).

10/804,081 Art Unit: 2618

Referring to Claim 74, Labun also teaches determining if a Bluetooth connection between the first and second terminals is acceptable using a control circuit responsive to the processor (see col. 9, lines 34-39).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-8 and 16-19 are allowed.

Regarding Claim 1, Philipsson and Labun do not teach, alone nor in combination, the combination of:

Using a notification for setting a short-range communication module in the second terminal into a page scanning mode for detecting paging signals directed to the second terminal;

responding to an RF-ID interrogation signal by transmitting a RF-ID response signal to the first terminal including identification information relating to the short-range communication module of the second terminal;

processing the received RF-ID response signal by the first terminal to activate a short-range communication module in the first terminal to initiate a shortened session setup by skipping the inquiry mode; transmitting a short-range paging signal directed to the second terminal based on information of the received RF-ID response signal and entering a page mode to establish a short-range connection with the second terminal; and

detecting the paging signal by the short range communication module in the second terminal for immediate establishment of a short range connection between the first and second terminals by skipping the inquiry mode.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 56-74 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eugene Yun Examiner Art Unit 2618

EY

MATTHEW ANDERSON SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER